

REMARKS

1. Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed September 18, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 49, 50, 51, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,341,316 (Kloba). Further, the Examiner rejected claims 1-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over a combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,513 (Prithviraj) and Kloba.

2. Summary of the Claimed Invention

Applicant's claimed invention is generally directed to a method and system of using a wireless communication device to manage a network via a proxy server. As shown in Figure 1, the wireless communication device 100 sends a compact transfer protocol (CTP) query to a proxy server 180. The proxy server 180 then converts the CTP query 124 to a hyper-text transfer protocol (HTTP) query 126, which is sent to a web server 140. See Applicant's specification at Figure 1, and at Figure 2, blocks 240, 260, 270, and 280.

On page 130, lines 19-21, Applicant's specification explains that "[w]hen a server dependent form is submitted by the wireless client 405, the client sends the inputted values of each field up to the proxy server 180 along with the field index." Applicant's specification explains that "[i]t is then up to the proxy server 180 to fetch the original HTML form from the Internet, lookup the actual field names and selection values for each of the fields in the form, and send a standard form submittal to the CGI script on the server." *Id.* at page 130, lines 21-24.

As an example, Applicant's specification explains that "[n]ormally, form submissions are accomplished through URLs such as:

<http://www.server.com/cgi-bin/submit?name=deb&sex=f&ship=lweek>". *Id.* at page 130, line 30-31.

In this example, Applicant's specification explains that the URL "sends the form parameter info 'name=deb&sex=f&ship=1week' to the CGI script called 'submit' which is in the CGI-bin directory of the server www.server.com." *Id.* at page 131, lines 1-3. Applicant's specification continues to explain that the "form parameter information indicates that the name field was filled in with the text 'deb' and the radio button with a name attribute of 'sex' and a value attribute of 'f' was selected and that the submit button with a value of '1 week' was pressed." *Id.* at page 131, lines 1-6.

Applicant's specification explains that in a server dependent CML [compact markup language] form, however, "there is no URL for the web server and CGI script (the action attribute of the HTML <form> tag). Also, there are no field name attributes (like "name" or "sex"), nor are there any value attributes for the radio buttons (like "m" or "f") in the server dependent form." *Id.* at page 132, lines 10-13. Applicant's specification explains that "[t]he only information the wireless client 405 has about the form is its field input types and their relative order in the form." *Id.* at page 132, lines 13-15. In order to submit this form, the "wireless client 405 sends the following URL to the proxy server 180:

<http://www.servercom!forms/myform.html?a/a=deb/c/e>" *Id.* at page 132, lines 16-18.

On page 132, lines 19-29, Applicant's specification explains the following regarding this URL that is being sent to the proxy server:

Notice that <http://www.server.com/forms/myform.html> is the name of the form itself that is being submitted (not the CGI-script that processes it). In the parameter list, the first "a" is the form index (obtained from the formindex attribute of the tagForm tag) the next "a" is the index of the first field in the form (using the base 26 number system introduced above in the Encoding Indirect Hyperlinks section). The next item in the list is the inputted value corresponding to the first field, "deb". The "c" is the index of the third field in the form and because the third field is a simple radio control, it does not have an associated value. The "e" is the index of the submit button that was pressed (e.g., the button with the value of "1 week"). The submit button index is included even if the form

only has 1 submit button. Also, between each of the field entries in the parameter list is a “/” character.

In this regard, each of Applicant’s independent claims 1, 25, and 49, as amended, is directed to a system and method of modifying a uniform resource locator (URL), wherein the modified URL includes (i) a page name, (ii) a field index value for each of the data fields, and (iii) user data associated with each of the field index values and transmitting the modified URL to a proxy server by using a compact transfer protocol (CTP), wherein the proxy server uses the modified URL to (i) generate a HTTP query and to (ii) send the HTTP query to a web server.

3. Summary of Cited Art

a. Prithviraj

Prithviraj is directed a system and method for managing networks using browsers. *Id.* at Abstract, and at column 2, lines 47-48. Prithviraj discloses that the “present invention is implemented on a central network management station and [that] a user can manage the network from any remote computer system implementing a browser”. *Id.* at column 2, lines 48-52.

Using the browser, the user can access various Applet displays and hypertext documents that are stored on the server. *Id.* at column 2, lines 52-54 and at column 3, lines 49-50. Prithviraj teaches that “[b]y simply clicking on the Applet displays and the hypertext links in the Hypertext documents, the user can manage the network.” *Id.* at column 2, lines 54-56.

In order to view the status of a subject network element, the user actuates the appropriate hypertext links via the browser. *Id.* at column 3, lines 51-53. Such actuation specifies a desired template. The user also specifies an identifier (e.g., a unique Internet Protocol Address) of a subject network element from which to retrieve data dynamically and display using the template. *Id.* at column 3, lines 54-57.

In this way, according to Prithviraj, when “a user clicks on the network element display, network management station automatically identifies the corresponding home page (hypertext document), and sends the document to the browser for display.” *Id.* at column 4, lines 36-40.

b. Kloba

Kloba is directed to a method of uploading web content to a mobile device and then allowing the user to operate the mobile device and interact with uploaded web content, while the device is in an off-line mode. Changes made to the uploaded web content are cached on the mobile device and then synchronized with a server at a later point in time. *See* Kloba, at abstract, and column 5, lines 35-55.

As an example, in reference to Figure 1D, Kloba teaches that in step 162A “a page is displayed by user interface 144 that contains form elements.” *Id.* at column 15, line 67 to column 16 line 1. According to Kloba, form elements may contain fields for the entry of data. *Id.* at column 16, lines 1-9. For example, a user may be presented with radio boxes, check boxes, and/or pop-up menus. *Id.* A user may then be able to use these fields on the page to enter data. *Id.* The entered data is then cached for later synchronization. *Id.* at column 16, line 10 and Step 162C.

During the synchronization process, “data is compared to the data that is known to be on the client and then the client is updated all at once in a one-up/one-down synchronization method, which is represented in FIG 1X.” *Id.* at column 5, lines 53-56.

4. Response to Examiner’s Rejections

a. Response to Examiner’s Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 49, 50, 61, and 62 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kloba. Applicant respectfully traverses this anticipation rejection,

because the Examiner has not established that Kloba teaches each and every element of any of amended independent claim 49 as would be required to support an anticipation rejection under M.P.E.P. § 2131. In particular, the Examiner has not established that Kloba teaches “a palm-sized computer running a browser application, wherein the browser application sends a modified Uniform Resource Locator (URL) to a proxy server using a compact transfer protocol (CTP), wherein the URL includes (i) the page name, (ii) a field index value indicating a relative order for each of the data fields on the page, and (iii) network inventory scope choices associated with the field index values”, as recited by amended independent claim 49.

As noted above, Kloba is directed to method of synchronizing data between a client and a server by comparing data stored on a client device with data stored on a server. *See* Kloba, at column 5, lines 53-56. According to Kloba, the method of synchronizing involves identifying a “delta.” *Id.* at column 19, lines 37-38. Kloba teaches that a delta is a set of “differences between versions of content or, more generally, objects (i.e., different versions of the same pages, documents, links, images, applications, services, etc.). Once the delta has been identified, the server is updated accordingly by sending delta from the client to the server. *Id.* at column 20, lines 20-25.

Kloba, however, does not teach of modifying a uniform resource locator (URL) while synchronizing data between a client and a server. Applicant’s independent claim 1 (and similarly Applicant’s independent claim 25 and 49) requires a method of modifying a uniform resource locator (URL) while sending data from a client to a proxy server wherein the modified URL includes (i) a page name, (ii) a field index value for each of the data fields, and (iii) user data associated with each of the field index values and then transmitting the modified URL to a proxy server by using a compact transfer protocol (CTP), wherein the proxy server uses the

modified URL to (i) generate a HTTP query and to (ii) send the HTTP query to a web server. Applicant finds no portion in Kloba that teaches this method of receiving updated network information as recited in Applicant's amended independent claim 1 (and similarly in Applicant's independent claim 25 and 49, as amended).

Consequently, Kloba does not anticipate any of these claims. Each of claims 2-22, 26-46, and 50-63 depends from, and thus incorporates all of the limitations of, one of these independent claims. Thus, for at least the same reason, Kloba also does not anticipate any of these dependent claims.

b. Response to Examiner's Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 1-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over a combination of Prithviraj and Kloba.

Under M.P.E.P. § 2143, a combination of references renders a patent claim obvious only if the combination of references discloses or suggests each and every element as recited in the claim. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejections of the pending claims because the combination of Prithviraj and Kloba fails to teach the combination of elements recited in any of the pending claims. In particular, the combination of Prithviraj and Kloba fails to teach a method of modifying a uniform resource locator (URL), wherein the modified URL includes (i) a page name, (ii) a field index value for each of the data fields, and (iii) user data associated with each of the field index values and transmitting the modified URL to a proxy server by using a compact transfer protocol (CTP), wherein the proxy server uses the modified URL to (i) generate a HTTP query and to (ii) send the HTTP query to a web server.

As explained above, both Prithviraj and Kloba are directed a method of managing a network via client device. Prithviraj is directed to managing a network by allowing a user to

access hypertext documents stored on a server via a browser that is running on a remote computer system. Kloba is directed to managing a network by allowing a user to interact with downloaded web-content while the device is off-line, and then synchronize any changes made at a later point in time. Neither reference, however, teaches a method of modifying a uniform resource locator (URL), wherein the modified URL includes (i) a page name, (ii) a field index value for each of the data fields, and (iii) user data associated with each of the field index values and transmitting the modified URL to a proxy server by using a compact transfer protocol (CTP), wherein the proxy server uses the modified URL to (i) generate a HTTP query and to (ii) send the HTTP query to a web server. As such, independent claims 1, 25, and 49, as amended, are patentable over the combination of Prithviraj and Kloba. Claims 2-22, 26-46, and 50-63 depends from, and thus incorporates all of the limitations of, one of these independent claims. Thus, for at least the same reason, these dependent claims are also patentable over the combination of Prithviraj and Kloba.

5. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-63 are allowable, and thus Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of these claims. Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3351.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

January 18, 2007

By: /omardgalaria/
Omar D. Galaria
Reg. No. 59,207